

**ALBERTA RESPONSE  
TO THE  
DRAFT FOUNDATION DOCUMENT  
FOR THE DEVELOPMENT  
OF THE  
WESTERN CANADIAN PROTOCOL  
SOCIAL STUDIES K-12  
COMMON CURRICULUM FRAMEWORK**

November 1999

## ALBERTA LEARNING CATALOGUING IN PUBLICATION DATA

Alberta. Alberta learning.

Alberta response to the draft foundation document for the development of the Western Canadian Protocol Social Studies K–12, Common Curriculum Framework.

URL: <<http://ednet.edc.gov.ab.ca>>

ISBN 0–7785–0782–3

1. Social sciences—Study and teaching—Alberta. I. Title. II. Western Canadian Protocol Social Studies K–12, Common Curriculum Framework.

H 62.5.C2.A333 1999 300.7

Copies are available by downloading and printing from the Social Studies section of the Alberta Learning web site.

For further information, contact the Director, Curriculum Standards Branch, telephone 780–427–2984, fax 780–422–3745; or the Director, Language Services Branch, telephone 427–2940, fax 422–1947; 11160 Jasper Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta, T5K 0L2. Inside Alberta, dial 310–0000 to be connected toll free.

The primary intended audience for this document is:


<i>Administrators</i>	✓
<i>Counsellors</i>	✓
<i>General Audience</i>	✓
<i>Parent School Councils</i>	✓
<i>Parents</i>	✓
<i>Students</i>	
<i>Teachers</i>	✓

Copyright ©1999, the Crown in Right of Alberta, as represented by the Minister of Learning. Alberta Learning, 11160 Jasper Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta, T5K 0L2 Canada.

Permission is given by the copyright owner to reproduce this document for educational purposes and on a nonprofit basis.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Section 1: Executive Summary .....	1
Section 2: Background .....	3
A. Consultation Forums .....	3
B. Other Consultation .....	3
Section 3: Summary of Responses and Recommendations .....	5
Section 4: Other Recommendations .....	11
General Support .....	11
Specificity/Distinct Outcomes for Two Groups .....	11
Identity .....	12
Citizenship .....	13
Role of Social Studies and Guiding Principles .....	13
Aboriginal People .....	14
Explicit Research Basis .....	14
Other Ideas .....	15
Recommendations .....	15
Section 5: Appendices	
Appendix A—The Respondents .....	16
Appendix B—Quantitative Data .....	21
Appendix C—Summary of Coded Comments .....	26



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2015

<https://archive.org/details/albertaresponset00albe>

## Section 1: Executive Summary

Alberta has been an active participant in the preliminary work that has begun on the Western Canadian Protocol Social Studies K–12 Common Curriculum Framework. The first stage in the development process was the creation of a draft Foundation Document that was the object of jurisdictional consultation from May to October 1999. The primary method of gathering responses to the draft document was through the use of a common Response Form.

Every attempt was made to provide opportunities for a wide range of stakeholders to respond to the draft. The intent was not to conduct a purely quantitative survey of the results, but to capture areas of agreement and areas of concern through a combination of numerical data and comments. It is important to note that readers need to apply some cautions in the interpretation of the numerical data included in this report.

Overall, general support was given for the following:

- the participation of Aboriginal and Francophone “voices” in the development of the document and future development of the common curriculum framework
- the first paragraph of the vision statement
- the definition of Social Studies, particularly the reference to “active and responsible citizens”
- the organizers included in the model of social studies
- the roles of social studies and principles for writing a common curriculum framework.

**Note:** As a whole, there was a high level of support for the draft Foundation Document from respondents most affiliated with Francophone student populations.

Although the draft Foundation Document received general support, the following areas of concern have been identified.

- The specific references to Aboriginal and Francophone education and students in the Introduction, Vision, Role of Social Studies, and Guiding Principles have generated a negative response from many of the respondents. Suggestions range from deleting these, moving them elsewhere in the document or lessening the emphasis.  
**Note:** The reaction varied on these sections depending upon the student population with which respondents were primarily affiliated. For example, the respondents primarily associated with Francophone student populations responded positively to those sections containing specific references.
- There appeared to be confusion about the inclusion of distinctive outcomes and the need for distinctive outcomes within a social studies common curriculum framework.
- The document does not link one section to another in a meaningful way. Repetition, redundancy and contradiction have been noted by many respondents.
- The use of the phrase “English Language” was not well-received.
- The document does not address the multiple cultural perspectives in a meaningful way.
- The concept of “citizenship” is not well-developed.
- The document does not explicitly address learning theory, cognitive development, orientations to social studies and processes.

Over thirty specific recommendations have been included in Sections 3 and 4 of this report to address the concerns that have been expressed about the draft Foundation Document and to provide direction and support to the development of the Social Studies K–12 Common Curriculum Framework. Some recommendations deal with specific sections of the draft Foundation Document; others are broad in their scope. Those found in Section 3 result from information gathered on the Response Form; and those found in Section 4 result from information included in submissions from individuals, school districts and organizations.

Overall, recommendations express the need to:

- clarify the purpose and intent of distinctive outcomes and their relationship to the common core outcomes
- address the multiple cultural component
- address the fundamental issue of citizenship and respect for diversity
- review the document for clarity, consistency, overlap, repetition and focusing on responsibilities that are within social studies
- be explicit about learning theory, cognitive development and orientations to social studies drawn from the current research.

This report has been submitted to Manitoba to be incorporated into an interjurisdictional report representing all WCP partners. It is expected that the interjurisdictional report will be completed by the end of November 1999.

## Section 2: Background

### A. Consultation Forums

In May and June 1999, Alberta Learning conducted a series of province-wide consultation forums to provide input into a review of the draft Foundation Document for the development of the Western Canadian Protocol Social Studies K–12 Common Curriculum Framework. It is important for Alberta Learning, early in the development process, to have the input of social studies teachers, parents, students, administrators and representatives of universities, professional education organizations, aboriginal organizations, Francophone organizations and the community. A total of 16 consultation forums were held (1 Francophone), and approximately 550 individuals attended.

Invitations for the forums were sent to school superintendents and organizations. Selections of representatives were made by those individuals and groups. The forum conducted in French included representatives from Francophone schools/programs and the Francophone community.

Agendas were identical for all consultation forums and, where possible, all Alberta Learning WCP representatives, including Aboriginal and Francophone representatives, were involved in conducting the sessions. Each forum was 2 ½ hours in length and began with participants identifying the three most important things to include in a Social Studies K–12 Common Curriculum Framework for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Presenters then provided background to the WCP Social Studies K–12 Project and the draft Foundation Document. Participants then reviewed the draft document in small groups.

The following is a list of the locations and dates of the forums.

Red Deer	–	May 10, 1999 (one session)
Calgary	–	May 12 and 13, 1999 (four sessions)
Grande Prairie	–	May 17, 1999 (one session)
Lac La Biche	–	May 19, 1999 (one session)
Edmonton	–	May 21, 1999 (one session – Francophone)
Medicine Hat	–	June 1, 1999 (one session)
Lethbridge	–	June 2, 1999 (one session)
Ft. McMurray	–	June 4, 1999 (one session)
St. Paul	–	June 7, 1999 (one session)
Edmonton	–	June 9 and 10, 1999 (four sessions)

### B. Other Consultation

From the middle of May until September 30, 1999, the draft document and response forms were available on the Alberta Learning web site. An interactive response form was available in English and a print version was available in French. This provided the opportunity for interested individuals and groups to access the draft and respond either by sending a copy to the address

provided or through an interactive form. The address of the web site was provided to all consultation forum participants as well as to all superintendents and school principals in Alberta. A brochure sent to all schools also included this information.

As will be mentioned later in this report, during this same time period a number of interested individuals, organizations and school districts took the opportunity to provide submissions and letters to the consultation process.



## Section 3: Summary of Responses and Recommendations

**Note:** Please refer to Appendix B for a reporting of quantitative data for all respondents, as well as respondents by affiliation with student populations. Refer to Appendix C for coded comments for each of the following Response Form questions.

Response survey data given for each of questions 1–10 is the sum of all data collected on the Response Forms. Please refer to Appendix B for a summary of data by affiliation with student populations.

### **QUESTION 1. The introduction clearly indicates the intention of the Foundation Document.**

#### **Summary of findings**

Response survey data: 75% (350) agreed, 15% (71) neutral, 10% (45) disagreed

Most respondents indicated that the first and second paragraphs were acceptable. Concern was expressed about the third paragraph and indicated that respondents appeared to misunderstand the purpose and intent of the distinctive outcomes for Francophone and Aboriginal students. Some indicated that this was divisive and that a common curriculum framework should not include distinctive outcomes. Others indicated that an addition should be made to the introduction about the multiple cultural perspectives.

#### **Recommendations**

- That information clarifying the purpose and intent of the distinctive outcomes for Francophone and Aboriginal students be stated in the introduction.
- That the relationship between the common core of learning outcomes and distinctive outcomes for Aboriginal and Francophone students be clarified and added to the introduction.
- That a statement be added to the introduction indicating that the common curriculum framework will be supportive of the goals of Francophone and Aboriginal education.
- That new information be added to the introduction to address the multiple cultural perspectives.
- That “multiple cultural perspectives” be replaced with a more suitable term.

### **QUESTION 2. The introduction effectively describes the philosophical background for the development of the Western Canadian Protocol Common Curriculum Framework for Social Studies K–12.**

#### **Summary of findings**

Response survey data: 56% (253) agreed, 23% (105) neutral, 21% (92) disagreed

Some respondents did not feel that the introduction provided sufficient philosophical background. The common core of learning outcomes needs to be described. As in Question 1,

many respondents restated misunderstanding, confusion and negative feelings about the purpose and intent of the distinctive outcomes for Francophone and Aboriginal students.

### **Recommendations**

- **That the introduction provides the intent of the Foundation Document and does not attempt to provide the philosophical background for the entire project. The Foundation Document in its entirety is to provide the philosophical background for the project.**

**QUESTION 3. The Vision Statement contained in the Foundation Document reflects a vision for students in Western and Northern Canada with which I/we agree.**

### **Summary of findings**

Response survey data: 34% (157) agreed, 32% (149) neutral, 34% (161) disagreed

As demonstrated by the quantitative data results, the vision statement generated diverse responses. This was also demonstrated by the comments. Generally the response to the first paragraph was positive, although some discomfort was evident with the listing of groups, particularly the use of the phrase “English Language.” It was evident through the comments that the preference of a large number of respondents was for the first paragraph to be the vision statement and that additional paragraphs would provide clarification and further information to support the vision statement. Strong support was demonstrated for the inclusiveness of the vision. Many identified the inclusion of special interest paragraphs in the vision statement as problematic. There was recognition of Francophone/Aboriginal needs. Some suggested the addition of a fourth paragraph identifying the needs of multiple cultural perspectives. Respondents indicated that the phrase “Canadian spirit” was worth pursuing; however, some indicated that they were not sure what it meant. A few respondents commented on the inclusion of distinctive identities versus Canadian unity. The data indicates strong support from respondents affiliated with Francophone student populations. Respondents affiliated with Aboriginal student populations reflected data similar to that from all respondents.

### **Recommendations**

- **That the first paragraph become the vision statement, with consideration being given to finding a better way to be inclusive rather than listing the groups.**
- **That the phrase “English Language” be removed or replaced with a more suitable phrase.**
- **That the second and third paragraphs provide necessary additional support information for the vision statement.**
- **That an additional paragraph be added to address multiple cultural perspectives.**

**QUESTION 4. This section provides an appropriate definition of Social Studies for the purpose of the development of The Common Curriculum Framework for Social Studies Kindergarten–Grade 12.**

**Summary of findings**

Response survey data: 81% (392) agreed, 14% (65) neutral, 5% (25) disagreed

There was generally overwhelming support for the definition. Respondents particularly were pleased with the emphasis on “interdisciplinary” and “active and responsible citizenship.” There seemed to be some confusion and concern regarding the inclusion of “spiritual,” and many seemed to associate it only with the Aboriginal perspective. The definition included in the Aboriginal background may have led to this confusion. There was strong support for the inclusion of social studies process skills being added to the definition. Several respondents commented on the redundancy of “interdisciplinary” and “subject that draws on many disciplines.” A few respondents commented on the definition being too broad/complex/narrow/needing reworking.

**Recommendations**

- **That clarification of the term “interdisciplinary” be included in a footnote and redundancy be removed—“interdisciplinary subject that draws upon many disciplines.”**
- **That the inclusion of “spiritual” be clarified.**
- **That processes defining social studies be included in the definition.**

**QUESTION 5. This section presents an appropriate description of the role of social studies for the purpose of the development of The Common Curriculum Framework for Social Studies Kindergarten–Grade 12.**

**Summary of findings**

Response survey data: 52% (233) agreed, 25% (113) neutral, 23% (101) disagreed

As there are 27 separate roles of social studies identified in this section, it was important to ascertain which seemed to generate the most concerns. It was evident by many comments that there was most discomfort with those that included specific references to Aboriginal and Francophone needs (2, 6, 24) although there was support for these as general roles of social studies. Most suggested that these be removed; moved to another section, such as the Background section; or receive less emphasis. Many respondents commented on the need for recognition for all students/all cultural groups. Respondents indicated that there was a need to group the roles more effectively and to make them clearer, as well as to eliminate overlap and repetition within the section. Some indicated that there is a need to link these more closely with other sections in the document. There were also many that questioned if these were all the “roles” of social studies. The data indicates strong support from respondents affiliated with Francophone student populations. Respondents affiliated with Aboriginal student populations reflected data similar to that from all respondents.

## **Recommendations**

- That the roles of social studies be reorganized and clarified to eliminate overlap and repetition.
- That this section be reviewed and limited to “roles” pertaining to social studies.
- That the references specific to Aboriginal and Francophone needs be placed in the Background section.

**QUESTION 6. This section clearly expresses the principles that are required to guide the development of The Common Curriculum Framework for Social Studies Kindergarten–Grade 12.**

## **Summary of findings**

Response survey data: 61% (256) agreed, 20% (83) neutral, 19% (77) disagreed

This section contains 22 principles. Many respondents indicated that there were too many principles and that many of these overlapped with the roles of social studies listed in the previous section. Principles 6, 9, 20, 21 and 22 generated concern by the respondents because of the specificity to Aboriginal and Francophone needs. Some respondents indicated that number 6 indicated a generalization about Aboriginal students and that it was not appropriate for this to be included. There was high support for this section from both respondents most affiliated with Francophone students and those most affiliated with Aboriginal student populations.

## **Recommendations**

- That number 6 be removed.
- That the list be shortened and reorganized to avoid overlap with other sections and to provide links to the rest of the document.
- That the intent of Principles 9, 20, 21 and 22 be retained, be rewritten in paragraph form and be taken into consideration in the writing of the common curriculum framework.

**QUESTION 7. The model, intended to guide the development of The Common Curriculum Framework for Social Studies Kindergarten–Grade 12, reflects the vision of the Foundation Document.**

## **Summary of findings**

Response survey data: 75% (300) agreed, 16% (64) neutral, 9% (32) disagreed

There was generally good support for this section—model, organizers and outcomes. A high number of comments dealt with concepts to be added within the organizers. The question of distinctive outcomes for Francophone and Aboriginal students was problematic for some respondents, while others recommended that there should be distinctive outcomes for all students/all multicultural groups. Some indicated that help would be needed for teachers of Aboriginal and Francophone students in regular classrooms. A few respondents requested more emphasis on history—global and Canadian.

### **Recommendations**

- **That concepts within the organizers be reviewed and new ones added, as appropriate.**
- **That the place of global and Canadian history be more clearly emphasized.**

**QUESTION 8. The Foundation Document reflects the Aboriginal perspective and therefore provides direction for development of The Common Curriculum Framework for Social Studies Kindergarten–Grade 12.**

### **Summary of findings**

Response survey data: 73% (255) agreed, 18% (64) neutral, 9% (32) disagreed

Generally the response to this section was positive, although many found it difficult to comment, as they did not feel qualified. 82% of respondents affiliated with Aboriginal student populations responded positively. It was noted that information contained in this section contradicted information provided elsewhere in the document. This section also generated some negative comments because of what was perceived to be too much emphasis in the document on Aboriginal and Francophone perspectives. Some suggested this section be placed in an appendix to the document.

### **Recommendations**

- **That this section be retained as it provides information on Aboriginal people and will provide a context for the developers of the common curriculum framework.**
- **That the section be reviewed for accuracy and placed in an appendix to the document.**

**QUESTION 9. The Foundation Document reflects the needs of Francophone students and therefore provides direction for the development of The Common Curriculum Framework for Social Studies Kindergarten–Grade 12.**

### **Summary of findings**

Response survey data: 71% (231) agreed, 16% (52) neutral, 13% (44) disagreed

There was generally good support for this section and total support from respondents most affiliated with Francophone students. They supported the section because it recognizes the reality/needs of students; it supports the goals of francophone education; and it emphasizes history, heritage, contributions and diversity. Many comments related to the fact that all cultural groups should be promoted not just two groups. Some respondents indicated that all students have needs similar to Francophone students (self-esteem, culture, identity); others are concerned with distinctiveness versus inclusiveness. Several comments were very specific and unique. There were some negative comments, and several respondents did not want to comment for a variety of reasons.

### **Recommendations**

- **That the addition of a section dealing with multiple cultural perspectives be explored and considered by the Project Team.**
- **That this section be placed in an appendix to the document.**

**QUESTION 10. The Foundation Document reflects the needs of French Immersion students and therefore provides direction for the development of The Common Curriculum Framework for Social Studies Kindergarten–Grade 12.**

**Summary of findings**

Response survey data: 75% (225) agreed, 18% (55) neutral, 7% (22) disagreed

There is generally good support for the section from the complete statistical data. There was high support from the Francophone community (93% agreed). A number of comments did not relate to this section, while others were very specific and unique. Some respondents did not want to comment for a variety of reasons. A concern was expressed by some respondents about the phrase “results are as good or higher than.” A few singled out resources in French as a concern.

**Recommendations**

- **That the phrase “results are as good or higher than” be either rephrased or removed.**

**QUESTION 11. Additional comments and suggestions (please note page/paragraph reference and attach additional pages if necessary).**

**Summary of findings**

There were many positive comments regarding intent and direction of the document. Most of the negative comments dealt with the specificity in the document regarding the needs of Aboriginal and Francophone students. A large number of respondents questioned this specificity and what was perceived as a lack of information regarding the multiple cultural perspectives. For many it was perceived to be a divisive document instead of one of inclusion. Although many agree with the general direction of the project, it is evident that there are serious concerns about how the document is written.

**Recommendations**

- **That the entire document be reviewed for clarity, consistency, overlap and repetition.**
- **That the Project Team clarifies the purpose and intent of distinctive outcomes and their relationship to common core outcomes.**

## Section 4: Other Recommendations

Many respondents elected to respond by letter, e-mail and formal submissions rather than using the Response Form. A number of these responses were collective responses from school jurisdictions and community organizations, and two were submitted from a professional organization. Many of these collective responses represent the opinions of many individuals. For example, the response that was submitted by the Social Studies Council of the Alberta Teachers' Association was sent on behalf of the membership of the council. In some cases, the submission was a summary of the responses of individuals who had represented an organization or school district at the consultation forums. For example, Calgary Roman Catholic Separate School District No. 1 gathered and summarized comments from their 20 representatives to the consultation forums. In addition a number of individuals chose to send letters or e-mail responses.

As these responses did not necessarily follow the format of the Response Form, general categories of responses have been identified and samples of respondents' comments have been included.

### General Support

The following is a sample of respondents' comments.

- It is certainly an ambitious project and one that will provide leadership and direction for social studies in and out of the classroom in the years ahead.
- You have a difficult task ahead. All the best!
- There is widespread agreement that the Foundation Document goes a long way to ensuring that social studies will be inclusive and focused on developing responsible citizenship and the active involvement of students in a multidisciplinary approach to learning.
- Support for reflecting different perspectives and distinct outcomes . . . “continuer dans la direction qui valorise la contribution ainsi que les différentes perspectives des aborigènes et francophones (et les autres groupes multiculturels). Étant donné leurs contextes et besoins culturels, je crois aussi à l'importance d'accorder aux aborigènes et aux francophones quelques R.A.S. spécifiques à eux.”

### Specificity/Distinct Outcomes for Two Groups

As indicated on the responses from the Response Forms, the inclusion in the Foundation Document of specific references to two cultural groups and the distinct outcomes have generated much response in the letters and submissions. Although there is positive support for the general intent of the document and the inclusion of these “voices” in the process of development, it is overwhelmingly evident that the document has failed to communicate this intent. Specific concerns were raised about separateness; disunity; equality for all Canadians; bias in lumping together other cultures; interest groups; inclusion of other cultures/all students; contradiction between the “common outcomes,” distinct outcomes and fundamental goals; using the social studies curriculum as a vehicle for “cultural recovery”; creating more problems than resolving them; and difficulty to standardize resources.

The following is a sample of respondents' comments.

- Clearly our District has a major concern with the focus of the Foundation Document. I believe social studies teachers want a document based on the equality of all Canadians regardless of race or background.
- As representatives we had the opportunity to hear the justification of why the wording was this way, but the printed document should be able to stand on its own without explanations or justification.
- There is ambiguity regarding the distinctive outcomes for aboriginal and francophone students. The goal of including these groups as “full and equal partners” is seen to be laudable, but there is widespread concern that the Foundation Document calls for different learning outcomes for these groups. How can the objective of common educational goals for social studies be reconciled with the call for distinctive outcomes for aboriginal and francophone students? A number of related concerns were also raised: Is there only one aboriginal perspective as the document implies? Can we characterize francophones as a single homogeneous group?
- The issue of “distinctive outcomes for Aboriginal and Francophone students” is extremely problematic in a number of ways. It is important to recognize the needs of these two groups, but to do so by providing for distinctive outcomes creates far more problems than it solves.
- I wonder if the word intercultural might be a useful addition to the document? This does not negate the use of the word “multicultural” but allows acknowledgement of the ways in which cultures interact—sometimes in negative ways, sometimes in positive ways. There is an underlying assumption within the draft document that Canadians have separate and distinct cultures that have no relationship to each other.

## Identity

Comments addressed the question of identity and the need for the document to provide a sophisticated understanding of its meaning, such as recognizing that individuals have multiple affiliations, layered/multiple identities; that gender, class and ethnicity affect identity formation; or that identity is constructed.

The following is a sample of respondents' comments.

- What is needed is a far more sophisticated understanding of what identity means, of the fact that in Canadian society individuals increasingly have multiple and layered identities, and of how our identities are socially and historically constructed as well as relational. We need to pay attention to the current research on cultural literacy and cultural studies in this regard, and to connect it directly to developing critical thinking skills in the context of better understanding cultural diversity. We also need to incorporate a greater recognition of how cultural practices cannot be separated from political and economic issues (particularly in how such elements as gender, race, and class are interconnected.)
- Again, the concerns raised centered on the implied distinction between aboriginal and francophone definitions of identity. While teachers agreed these perspectives require attention, there needs to be further discussion about how the broad goal of fostering cultural identity fits within the rubric of developing citizenship.



## Citizenship

Comments highlighted that the conception of citizenship was ambiguous, limited and not well-developed. They suggested that the conception of citizenship should: emphasize solidarity rather than individualism, and emphasize thinking, active and engaged citizens, actions and skills; be rooted in historical and contemporary understanding; promote engagement and action in the shared and common space; and define “a good citizen,” as well as the type of society for which students need to be prepared.

The following is a sample of respondents’ comments.

- We need to state explicitly that we want to develop citizens for a democratic, pluralistic, multicultural, and inclusive society, made up of communities that reflect those same attributes.
- In a related manner, the document’s ambiguous conception of “citizenship” needs to be much more systematically developed. We need to have a more explicit reflection on what Canadians need to share, on what it means to be a “good citizen.” It is important in this regard to emphasize a view of an active, engaged citizen; Benjamin Barber’s emphasis on *participation, deliberation, and agency* is very helpful in articulating the necessary central elements. The document also needs to clearly acknowledge that doing and thinking cannot be separated, and that social studies learning must involve “doing things in the common places of our lives.”
- The document’s conception of citizenship is also inadequate in its overemphasis on solitary rather than collective action; citizenship emerges as a highly individualistic enterprise.

## Role of Social Studies and Guiding Principles

As in the Response Form comments, these sections were identified as important. There is concern regarding the breadth of the roles that have been listed as the responsibility of social studies and regarding the lack of focus on what is important in social studies. Suggestions have been made that these lists be shortened.

The following is a sample of respondents’ comments.

- Social studies seems to have been the original catch-all that has led schools to take on inordinate responsibilities as a career development, social service, surrogate parent agency. Maybe we should challenge this unloading by paring down the scope of social studies.
- While many of the individual points are laudable, there is no attempt to provide some sense of relative importance, connections, and context to possible content and pedagogical principles of the roles and principles identified. How do these statements connect with the larger commitment to citizenship, how would social studies engender the broader purposes identified, and what are the implications for the actual practice of teaching and learning?
- So while teachers agreed that many of the guiding principles were worthwhile, there needs to be a systematic understanding of what is central to a social studies program.

## Aboriginal People

Questions were raised on the issue of spirituality and on overgeneralizations about Aboriginal people who are in the process of change.

The following is a sample of respondents' comments.

- Generally, when many aboriginal communities are in a state of activity around government, culture with abundant external and internal conflict, it is very difficult to arrive at good principles, since these are being sorted and defined. I think we could say the Aboriginal community is highly politicized right now and much effort and energy is going into shaping the new reality.
- While the recognition of Aboriginal spirituality is important, serious problems result from the constant equation of the Aboriginal with the spiritual. References to "the Aboriginal perspective" and assertions that "there is a similar perspective among all Aboriginal people" minimize the diversity that exists among Aboriginal people, and risks contributing to problems of overgeneralization about peoples and cultures.
- There was some concern raised with the identification of "spirituality" as a discrete focus of study separate from culture. The relationship between religion and culture needs to be more clearly developed.

## Explicit Research Basis

The lack of attention to learning theory, cognitive development and processes was raised. In addition, respondents identified the need to link these to goals, directions, principles and approaches to teaching.

The following is a sample of respondents' comments.

- Another concern raised in the Guiding Principles was the lack of attention to learning theory and psychological research on child development. Except for a general reference to students "constructing meaning," the Foundation Document appears relatively silent in its assumptions about how students learn. In particular, teachers identified the lack of reference to special needs students and alternative programming as a concern.
- There is a clear need for a more explicit consideration of some of the "process implications" of the directions outlined. That is, we need to consider more directly how these goals, directions, and principles get played out in approaches to teaching and learning.
- There seems to be no attention paid to assumptions about the mind of the learner, the stages of cognitive development of children and youth, and how learning theory will inform the further development of a common social studies curriculum. Any curriculum framework in social studies must be informed and grounded by an understanding of the cognitive development of students as they develop through the K-12 program.

## Other Ideas

Some respondents suggested ideas for future consideration during the development of a common curriculum framework.

The following is a sample of respondents' comments.

- May we please bring to your attention, however, the necessity for acknowledging the important role which women have played in the building of Canada?
- Museum educators feel that our heritage sites and museums offer something unique in terms of not only experience for children but in relation to the development of research skills and the development of a sense of community and place—concepts both so vital to an effective social studies program.
- I feel, once again, that Social Studies is an objective course in which students should be encouraged to think clearly and responsibly about controversial issues regardless of the final conclusions that they reach.
- I would suggest that the listed outcomes be quite specific, such as demonstrating skill in reading editorials, interpreting editorial cartoons, analyzing statistical information and reading maps.
- I would suggest that those responsible for developing resource materials for a common curriculum create a bank of sources that teachers could use in teaching these valuable skills to students.

## Recommendations

In addition to earlier recommendations, the following are recommendations that Alberta Learning considers essential to the successful development of the common curriculum framework.

- **That a panel of experts on identity, cultural diversity and citizenship be created to advise the WCP Social Studies K–12 Project Team throughout the development process. Alberta Learning offers to take responsibility for this part of the content validation.**
- **That the concept of “citizenship” be expanded to incorporate current thinking and research, leading to social cohesion, the sharing of a common space and the adherence to democratic values while respecting diversity and pluralism.**
- **That the Foundation Document be reviewed and revised expeditiously for use as the philosophical basis for the common curriculum framework.**
- **That issues related to learning theory, orientations to social studies and cognitive development be clarified in the common curriculum framework.**
- **That the literature/research reviews—*Aboriginal Perspective on Education: A Vision of Cultural Context Within the Framework of Social Studies*; *Aperçu de recherches en vue de l'élaboration du Cadre commun de résultats d'apprentissage en sciences humaines (M–12) du Protocole de l'Ouest canadien pour l'éducation francophone*; *Overview of Related Research to Inform the Development of the Western Canadian Protocol Social Studies (K–12) Common Curriculum Framework for Francophone Education*; *Reshaping the Future of Social Studies*—be given strong consideration throughout the common curriculum framework development process.**

## **Section 5: Appendices**

### **APPENDIX A – THE RESPONDENTS**

#### **WCP Social Studies – Respondent Summary – by Reviewer Type**

---

<b>225</b>	<b>Individual</b>
<b>80</b>	<b>Group of educators</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Educational partner organization</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Individual</b> <b>Educational partner organization</b>

## WCP Social Studies – Respondent Summary – by Affiliation

---

232	Classroom Teacher
16	School Administrator
8	University/College Faculty
7	School Board Member
5	Parent Organization
5	Classroom Teacher, Parent
3	Professional Organization
2	Parent
2	Classroom Teacher, School Administrator
1	University, Independent SS Consultant
1	Teacher Librarian, K–6
1	Subject Specialist: SS
1	SS Educator/USA Canada
1	Retired Ministry Official
1	Professional Organization, Heritage Organization Parent
1	Ministry/Department Official
1	Metis Settlements General Council/Strategic Training
1	Historic Sites Services Ukrainian Cultural Heritage Village
1	Curriculum Specialist
1	Curriculum Coordinator for Division

- 1 Curriculum Consultant
- 1 Consultant
- 1 Classroom Teacher, University, School Administrator
- 1 Classroom Teacher, University
- 1 Classroom Teacher  
Student Evaluation
- 1 Classroom Teacher, Parent Organization
- 1 Classroom Teacher, Consultant
- 1 Business/Industry Representative
- 1 Association Canadienne-Francaise de l'Alberta
- 1 Alberta Learning – Net
- 1 Admin. Services Consultant

**WCP Social Studies – Respondent Summary –  
by Student Population Group**

---

<b>225</b>	<b>Anglophone/Multicultural</b>
<b>32</b>	<b>Francophone</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Aboriginal Anglophone/Multicultural</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Aboriginal</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>French Immersion</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Immersion</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Ukrainian</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>This question is offensive</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>No affiliation</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Mennonites</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Integrated Occupation Program</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Includes all groups</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Hutterite</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>French Immersion/Second Language</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>English speaking/multicultural</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>English Language</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Canadian/English Language</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Anglophone/Multicultural Ukrainian Bilingual Groups</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Anglophone/Multicultural Aboriginal</b>

**1 Anglophone – Polish Bilingual**

**1 Anglophone only**

**1 All of the above and more**

**1 Albertans/Canadians**

**1 Adult – preservice teachers**

**1 Aboriginal  
Anglophone/Multicultural  
University level students**



## **APPENDIX B – QUANTITATIVE DATA**

- ALL RESPONDENTS
- AFFILIATION WITH ABORIGINAL STUDENT POPULATIONS
- AFFILIATION WITH FRANCOPHONE STUDENT POPULATIONS
- AFFILIATION WITH STUDENT POPULATIONS OTHER THAN ABORIGINAL OR FRANCOPHONE STUDENT POPULATIONS

ALL RESPONDENTS

Social Studies WCP				
313 responses received				
Question	Ratings			Responses rec'd
	1-2	3	4-5	
1	9.62% 45	15.17% 71	75.21% 352	468
2	20.35% 92	23.45% 106	56.19% 254	452
3	34.33% 161	31.77% 149	33.90% 159	469
4	5.17% 25	13.43% 65	81.40% 394	484
5	22.49% 101	25.17% 113	52.34% 235	449
6	18.47% 77	19.90% 83	61.63% 257	417
7	9.41% 38	15.84% 64	74.75% 302	404
8	9.07% 32	18.13% 64	72.80% 257	353
9	13.41% 44	15.85% 52	70.73% 232	328
10	7.26% 22	17.82% 54	74.92% 227	303

AFFILIATION WITH ABORIGINAL STUDENT POPULATIONS

Social Studies WCP				
19 responses received				
Question	Ratings			Responses rec'd
	1-2	3	4-5	
1	17.65% 6	2.94% 1	79.41% 27	34
2	23.53% 8	14.71% 5	61.76% 21	34
3	29.41% 10	38.24% 13	32.35% 11	34
4	17.65% 6	8.82% 3	73.53% 25	34
5	23.53% 8	29.41% 10	47.06% 16	34
6	18.75% 6	3.13% 1	78.13% 25	32
7		15.15% 5	84.85% 28	33
8	16.13% 5		83.87% 26	31
9	42.86% 9	14.29% 3	42.86% 9	21
10		10.53% 2	89.47% 17	19

## AFFILIATION WITH FRANCOPHONE STUDENT POPULATIONS

Social Studies WCP 32 responses received				
Question	Ratings			Responses rec'd
	1-2	3	4-5	
1		6.45%	93.55%	31
		2	29	
2	15.63%	18.75%	65.63%	32
	5	6	21	
3		21.43%	78.57%	28
		6	22	
4	3.23%	3.23%	93.55%	31
	1	1	29	
5	12.90%	6.45%	80.65%	31
	4	2	25	
6	9.68%	3.23%	87.10%	31
	3	1	27	
7		7.14%	92.86%	28
		2	26	
8		3.57%	96.43%	28
		1	27	
9			100.00%	28
			28	
10		7.14%	92.86%	28
		2	26	

AFFILIATION WITH STUDENT POPULATIONS OTHER THAN  
ABORIGINAL OR FRANCOPHONE STUDENT POPULATIONS

Social Studies WCP 239 responses received				
Question	Ratings			Responses rec'd
	1-2	3	4-5	
1	10.34% 39	16.71% 63	72.94% 275	377
2	22.19% 81	24.66% 90	53.15% 194	365
3	36.88% 142	31.17% 120	31.95% 123	385
4	5.81% 23	13.89% 55	80.30% 318	396
5	23.33% 84	25.28% 91	51.39% 185	360
6	19.21% 63	21.95% 72	58.84% 193	328
7	11.01% 35	16.04% 51	72.96% 232	318
8	11.07% 31	20.71% 58	68.21% 191	280
9	16.02% 41	16.41% 42	67.58% 173	256
10	8.66% 20	19.48% 45	71.86% 166	231

## APPENDIX C – SUMMARY OF CODED COMMENTS

Comments for each question were individually read and assigned a numbered code. Numbers in brackets to the right indicate the number of comments assigned to that code.

### QUESTION 1 – CLEAR INTRODUCTION

#### 1-49 SUPPORT

- 01 Four major goals focus on what is relevant. (01)
- 02 Distinctive outcomes develop inclusive learning and thinking for all. (01)
- 03 Like the term human sciences. (01)
- 04 Ease of transfer from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. (09)
- 05 Positive statement: This collaboration is a unique... Canada. (02)
- 06 Inclusion of Aboriginal and Francophone perspective is important in Canadian history. (05)
- 07 Aboriginal and Francophone representatives are included. (05)
- 08 Intent exists to create common curriculum. (01)
- 09 Francophone students need specific objectives. (01)
- 48 Generally supportive. (82)

#### 50-99 CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS

- 50 Questions the needs for clarification of distinctive outcomes and delivery of them. (30)
- 51 Too much emphasis on Aboriginal and Francophone perspectives while ignoring or at the expense of others and Canadianism as a whole. (36)
- 52 Little educational intent/do not agree with intent. (02)
- 53 The document does not support commonalities of content and learning outcomes. (06)
- 54 Trying to "fit" too much into one document. (02)

- 55 Aboriginal and Francophone background information should be at the front of the document. (01)
- 56 Questions the ranking of the four goals. (05)
- 57 Information is too general, vague, to provide more background. (06)
- 58 Add a #5 for the correction of social wrongs. (01)
- 59 Substitute "multiple cultures" for all students. (04)
- 60 Learning outcomes are mentioned, but not listed. (01)
- 61 Paragraph 2 should include Aboriginal and Francophone. (01)
- 62 The introduction could do more "justice" to the document. (02)
- 63 Needs clearer definitions i.e. "cadre". (01)
- 64 Paragraph 2, second last line - add Anglophone to this list. (01)
- 65 Paragraph 2, last line, add Aboriginal, Francophone and Anglophone to this line. (01)
- 66 Adapt the framework to meet the needs of the individual learner. (01)
- 67 Confusion with transfer from jurisdiction to jurisdiction statement. (04)
- 68 Employability skills for students are essential for the 21 century. (01)
- 69 Provide a more global approach. (01)
- 70 Are common educational goals referring to standardization. (01)
- 71 Need visual timeline/flowchart in document. (02)
- 72 The vocabulary used in the document is too complex. (01)
- 73 Need to acknowledge distinctive outcomes for all groups. (01)
- 74 Collaboration may reduce standards rather than raise them. (01)
- 75 Skills/process not emphasized. (01)
- 76 Need a better term than "English Language". (01)

77 Paragraph 3 – are Aboriginal and Francophone included in "all students"?	(01)
78 Omit "all" in all students.	(01)
99 Other comments.	(14)

## **QUESTION 2 – INTRODUCTION – PHILOSOPHY**

### **1-49 SUPPORT**

01 Four major goals focus on what is relevant.	(01)
46 Need to be clearer; to be developed.	(01)
47 Generally supportive for specific reasons.	(18)
48 Generally supportive.	(37)

### **50-99 CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

55 All students should be included.	(09)
56 Concerns over singling out Francophone and Aboriginals.	(33)
57 Clarification needed for Fr/AB outcomes/implications for program.	(10)
58 Concerns/contradictions regarding inclusion vs. separateness.	(09)
60 Concerns over philosophy: lack of/not clear/to be developed.	(27)
61 Document is political/not philosophical.	(04)
62 Section should be expanded/more detailed/scope too narrow.	(05)
63 Reason for WCP/scope of WCP.	(02)
64 Section needs to be more international less national.	(01)
65 Relationship between.	(02)
70 Add inquiry/pedagogy/critical-thinking skills.	(04)
71 Add ethics.	(01)



72 Too much information/parts not needed/reduce.	(02)
73 Project influenced by economics.	(01)
95 Concerns about evaluation.	(01)
96 Concerns over resources.	(02)
97 Concerns over funding/equity of funding.	(01)
98 Generally negative/disagree.	(14)
99 Other comments – one of a kind/very specific.	(05)
00 N/A; refers other sections of document.	(05)

### QUESTION 3 – VISION

#### 1-49 SUPPORT

01 Demographic realities of the West and North – “Canadian Citizenship”. Excellent!	(01)
02 The vision of contributing to a Canadian spirit, the clear explanation of that “Spirit”, inclusive of all Canadian students.	(16)
03 It (vision) will be reflective of all perspectives.	(03)
04 The Aboriginal culture is of utmost importance to our country as a whole, along with the Francophone culture.	(04)
05 I understand why you have emphasized the Aboriginal and Francophone.	(01)
06 The first paragraph is a well-stated vision of social studies.	(46)
07 The inclusion of the Francophone perspectives is an excellent addition.	(02)
08 Like local, national, and global.	(01)
09 Aboriginal emphasis is commendable.	(04)
10 Agree with more emphasis on Aboriginal history.	(01)

- 11 Agree with “active and responsible citizenship”. (02)
- 12 Both Francophone and Aboriginals need to relearn their cultures. (01)
- 13 Agree 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learner. (01)
- 48 Generally positive comments. (19)

**50-99 CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 50 The framework should put more focus on global education/citizenship/spirit. (13)
- 51 Omit paragraphs two and three from the document. (35)
- 52 Omit paragraph two from the document. (06)
- 53 Place paragraphs two and three in another part of the document, as footnotes, or in Program of Studies. (11)
- 54 A fourth paragraph could be added to represent the majority/multiple cultures, special needs perspective (1). (22)
- 55 Questions the addition of two cultural groups at the expense of other cultural groups. (41)
- 56 Does not reflect a vision of the majority of students. (01)
- 57 Place paragraph two in another part of the document. (i.e. role of social studies). (01)
- 58 Would like to see parallel structures for Aboriginal and Francophone perspectives. (06)
- 59 Aboriginal and Francophone perspectives should be included in the multicultural identity. (12)
- 60 Include/list other cultural groups, recognize all. (28)
- 61 Unity versus division: maintaining distinct identities while seeking Canadian unity for all. (05)
- 62 Add paragraphs 4 & 5 to deal with English Language and multiple cultures. (01)
- 63 Latter two paragraphs in a separate document. (01)

- 64 Like to see a vision emphasize thinking active citizenship. (01)
- 65 Questions the word “language” in English Language, line 3. (03)
- 66 Add “s” to learner and concept – line 2. (03)
- 67 Add to paragraph #3 “engendering understanding for all students with respect to the Francophone perspective”. (01)
- 68 Aboriginal, English language, Francophone and multiple cultural perspectives are not parallel. (02)
- 69 Variety of groups in Canada’s Aboriginal community. (01)
- 70 All students learn about all groups, including Aboriginals and Francophones. (02)
- 71 Vision does not address processes. (02)
- 72 These two groups (Aboriginal and Francophone) also need a vision/goals. (02)
- 73 Separate schools for culture and language. (01)
- 74 Difficult for students to understand the perspectives of other cultures. (01)
- 75 Does vision translate to Adult learner and life long learner? (01)
- 76 Define “spirit” in Canadian spirit. (06)
- 77 Add personal identity concept to statement before definition of Canadian citizenship. (02)
- 78 Francophones are also a founding nation. (01)
- 79 Add to paragraph #3 – Francophone contributions to western development. (01)
- 80 Different outcomes, curricula for each group. (04)
- 81 Include diverse learning needs of students. (01)
- 82 Reflects a different vision for Francophone and Aboriginal groups. (01)

83	Need clarification of “nature of the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century” and “the concept” of Canadian citizenship and identity.	(01)
84	Will the material adequately reflect the needs and differences between English, French and Aboriginals? The vision is retro-backward looking.	(03)
85	Must be a more inclusive way to include Aboriginal needs in the vision.	(01)
86	Vision is for Aboriginal students.	(01)
87	Multiculturalism separates: does not unite people.	(01)
88	Keep the Francophone section in.	(01)
89	Statement still suggests bias towards the Anglophone/ mainstream perspectives.	(02)
90	Add a French immersion perspective.	(01)
91	How prepared are teachers to reach this vision?	(01)
92	Not much emphasis on multiculturalism.	(01)
93	Define Canadian identity.	(01)
94	Limited vision statement: concept of identity needs to be emphasized.	(02)
95	Lengthy vision with a broad view.	(01)
96	Aboriginal and Francophone elements included in all curriculum.	(02)
97	Redefine culture.	(01)
98	Put mosaic in somewhere.	(01)
99	Other comments – one of a kind/very specific.	(13)
100	Teach French history.	(01)
101	Change concept of Canadian citizenship to responsible Canadian citizenship.	(02)

- 102 Terms “claim their identity” is vague. (01)
- 103 How will a teacher from dominant culture teach Aboriginal perspectives? (01)

#### **QUESTION 4 – DEFINITION**

##### **1-49 SUPPORT**

- 01 Covers all areas/includes all concepts of Social Studies/well thought out and inclusive. (7)
- 03 Important to mention the many disciplines the learner becomes involved with in attaining the vision. (34)
- 05 Liked "spiritual" components as defined/like inclusion of spirituality. (06)
- 06 Inclusion of Francophone is supported. (01)
- 10 "Economics" require more emphasis. (01)
- 48 Generally positive comments (e.g., "well written"). (62)

##### **50-99 CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 57 Concerned with spiritual, indicates teaching of religious morals/values/spiritual replacing religion. (11)
- 58 Definition needs reworking/adjustment. (06)
- 59 Interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary terms need to be explained. (12)
- 61 Too complex/broad. (09)
- 62 Too narrow. (03)
- 69 Redundant "interdisciplinary subject that deals upon many disciplines"/editing required. (13)
- 70 What about harmony as world citizens/role of citizenship/knowledgeable citizens. (09)
- 74 Stress Canadian content. (01)

- 95 Objects to special status for Aboriginal/Francophone; ignores multicultural nation. (04)
- 96 Process needs more emphasis/delineation. (13)
- 97 Add controversial issues and/or current issues and/or multiple perspectives. (03)
- 98 Generally negative comments. (05)
- 99 Other comments (e.g., not really a "subject"). (05)

## **QUESTION 5 – ROLE**

### **GENERAL COMMENTS**

#### **SUPPORT**

- G-48 Generally positive comments. (55)

#### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- G-01 Integration of technology. (01)
- G-02 Agree with intent but Change 2 and 6, wording. (12)
- G-03 Parallel document/section for F & A. (03)
- G-04 Too much emphasis of socialism and not enough on economic Input/outputs, economic responsibilities, more emphasis would be useful on employability skills (CONFERENCE BOARD). (01)
- G-05 Current events? (02)
- G-06 There is so much focus on F&A that there needs to be focus put forward on the multicultural anglophone majority. It seems to get lost/forgotten. (11)
- G-07 Group more effectively and clearly. (21)
- G-08 Add advance organizers perhaps drawing on statements in the definition. (01)
- G-09 Democratic values need to be emphasized. (02)

G-10	Are the rights and responsibilities of F & A students different from Canadian students?	(01)
G-11	Potential problems promoting certain groups rights and not others.	(04)
G-12	Organize around KSAs and reduce.	(13)
G-13	Too encompassing, unrealistic to provide all this in the context of a social studies program.	
G-14	Eliminate overlap and repetition.	(06)
G-15	Clarification of terminology.	(04)
G-16	More emphasis on commonality.	(01)
G-17	Available resources.	
G-18	8, 9, 10 combined.	(01)
G-19	More emphasis on Canadian history.	(01)
G-20	More emphasis on inquiry, critical and creative thinking.	(02)
G-21	Children need to know more about our past, our world and basic geography.	(01)
G-22	Leave specificity re A&F specific outcomes.	(02)
G-23	May be difficult to achieve and define.	(01)
G-24	Appears to over emphasize the Francophone culture.	(01)
G-25	Specific mention of Francophone – Aboriginal may cause some negative feelings.	(19)
G-26	Distinct roles should have been explained in the document.	(02)
G-27	Brief, succinct goal – some roles vague.	(01)
G-28	Add “develop individually and with others an action plan”.	(02)
G-29	Specific suggestions.	(21)
G-30	Some sound like outcomes.	(01)

G-31	“All” students should include Francophone and Aboriginal students.	(03)
G-32	7 and 8 in possible conflict with 9 and 10.	(05)
G-33	Global issues lacking/global geography/history.	(01)
G-34	Stronger language to reflect appreciation of “Canada”.	(02)
G-35	Needs to include programs such as “Project Business” to give students more background.	(02)
G-36	Oral history preservation and cultural preservation as responsible citizenship and stewardship.	(01)
G-47	Positive with specific reasons.	(01)
G-98	Generally negative comments.	(08)

## **STATEMENT 1**

### **SUPPORT**

1-48	Generally positive comments.	(01)
------	------------------------------	------

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

1-01	Add different levels of democracy i.e. activity/participation.	(01)
1-02	“Effect positive change”	(01)
1-98	Generally negative comments.	(01)

## **STATEMENT 2**

### **SUPPORT**

2-48	Generally positive comments.	(04)
------	------------------------------	------

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

2-01	Remove reference to F&A specificity.	(40)
2-02	Wording of specific comments “assert” and “understanding”.	(35)
2-03	Add English/Multicultural statement.	(13)



- 2-05 All students should be aware of all the group's rights. (01)  
2-98 Generally negative comments. (07)

### **STATEMENT 3**

#### **SUPPORT**

- 3-48 Generally positive comments. (01)

#### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 3-98 Generally negative comments. (01)

### **STATEMENT 4**

#### **SUPPORT**

- 4-48 Generally positive comments. (02)

#### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 4-01 Add government. (01)  
4-02 Leave out Francophone and Aboriginal. (01)  
4-03 Whose history? (01)  
4-98 Generally negative comments. (01)

### **STATEMENT 5**

#### **SUPPORT**

- 5-48 Generally positive comments. (01)

#### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 5-01 "Celebrate personal identity". (03)  
5-02 Eliminate "the" from in front of Canadian Identity. (02)  
5-03 Replace "celebrate and strengthen" with to "explore. (01)  
5-04 Question the use of "honor". (01)

5-98 Generally negative comments. (01)

## **STATEMENT 6**

### **SUPPORT**

6-48 Generally positive comments. (06)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

6-01 Remove specificity to A & F. (40)

6-02 Wording needs to be changed. (09)

6-03 Add multiple cultural perspectives. (09)

6-04 All students should “participate in building a dynamic community.” (01)

6-05 List Aboriginal first. (01)

6-98 Generally negative comments. (07)

## **STATEMENT 7**

### **SUPPORT**

7-48 Generally positive comments. (04)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

7-01 Add “integrate” or “express”. (02)

7-02 Less specifics re: to groups. (02)

7-03 Drop or revise. (05)

7-04 Should read “appreciate and respect the multiple cultural perspectives.” (02)

7-98 Generally negative comments. (01)

## **STATEMENT 8**

### **SUPPORT**

8-48 Generally positive comments. (01)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

8-01 Value and celebrate diversity. (03)

8-02 Elaborate on the diversity. (02)

8-98 Generally negative comments. (01)

## **STATEMENT 9**

### **SUPPORT**

9-48 Generally positive comments. (01)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

9-01 Equality must be defined. (03)

9-02 Add “justice”. (02)

9-98 Generally negative comments. (01)

## **STATEMENT 10**

### **SUPPORT**

10-48 Generally positive comments. (01)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

10-01 Add “responsibility”. (01)

## **STATEMENT 11**

### **SUPPORT**

11-48 Generally positive comments. (03)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 11-01 Add “responsible” before “action”. (02)
- 11-03 Add “positive” to action. (03)
- 11-04 “Appropriate” action. (01)
- 11-05 “Recognize, speak out, and take action on local national and world issues. (01)
- 11-06 History “is to understand the past”. (01)
- 11-07 “Speak out” too strong. (02)
- 11-08 Addition. (01)
- 11-98 Generally negative comments. (03)

## **STATEMENT 12**

### **SUPPORT**

- 12-48 Generally positive comments. (01)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 12-01 Whose history? (03)
- 12-02 Does “world history” mean European history? (01)
- 12-03 Canadian and World History – should include impact of each on the other. (01)

## **STATEMENT 13**

### **SUPPORT**

- 13-48 Generally positive comments. (01)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 13-01 Goal of considering contemporary issues from “diverse perspectives” is increasingly difficult. (01)
- 13-98 Generally negative comments. (01)

**STATEMENT 14**

**SUPPORT**

14-48 Generally positive comments. (01)

**STATEMENT 15**

**SUPPORT**

15-48 Generally positive comments. (01)

**CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

15-01 Vague (01)

**STATEMENT 16**

**SUPPORT**

16-48 Generally positive comments. (01)

**STATEMENT 17**

**SUPPORT**

17-48 Generally positive comments. (01)

**STATEMENT 18**

**SUPPORT**

18-48 Generally positive comments. (01)

**CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

18-01 Is this not a skill in the English Curriculum. (01)

**STATEMENT 19**

**SUPPORT**

19-48 Generally positive comments. (02)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

19-98 Generally negative comments. (01)

## **STATEMENT 20**

### **SUPPORT**

20-48 Generally positive comments. (02)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

20-01 “Limits of nature” – somewhat confusing term”. (05)

20-02 Other stewardship i.e. community, people, time, land. (01)

20-03 Foster a safe and caring environment for all. (01)

20-98 Generally negative comments. (01)

## **STATEMENT 21**

### **SUPPORT**

21-48 Generally positive comments. (02)

## **STATEMENT 22**

### **SUPPORT**

22-48 Generally positive comments. (03)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

22-01 “Construction of meaning” – what criteria will be used? (01)

22-02 Add “acquisition of knowledge”. (01)

## **STATEMENT 23**

### **SUPPORT**

23-48 Generally positive comments. (03)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

23-01 Add “evaluate” before “organize”. (01)

## **STATEMENT 24**

### **SUPPORT**

24-48 Generally positive comments. (03)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

24-01 Remove specific reference to Francophone. (34)

24-02 Add Aboriginal specifics. (03)

24-03 Addition re dominant cultures. (02)

24-98 Generally negative comments. (04)

## **STATEMENT 25**

### **SUPPORT**

25-48 Generally positive comments. (03)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

25-01 Develop “Integration” of technology. \* (02)

## **STATEMENT 26**

### **SUPPORT**

26-48 Generally positive comments. (03)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

26-01 Statement needs elaboration. (01)

26-02 Add “employability skills”. (01)

26-03 Recognize “competitiveness”. (02)

## **STATEMENT 27**

### **SUPPORT**

27-48 Generally positive comments. (04)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

27-01 Vague (05)

27-02 Add Science. (01)

## **QUESTION 6 – GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

### **GENERAL COMMENTS**

#### **SUPPORT**

G-48 Generally positive comments. (47)

#### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

G-01 Seems very eurocentric – where is the Asian influence. (01)

G-02 Pleased to see integration with Language Arts, drama, etc. (01)

G-03 20,21,22 should apply to all students/covered in other principles. (08)

G-04 Students need to be aware of global nature of the world. (05)

G-05 Separate Francophone and Aboriginal document or reorganize. (12)

G-06 Association of “spirituality” with Aboriginal students – alone, seems misguided – all religions will argue for their inherent spirituality. (29)

G-07 Too many? Organize these/group better. (21)

G-08 More focus on Technology. (02)

G-09 Link to Social Studies Organizers. (01)



G-10	May be problem if students put so much emphasis on studying issues from the perspective of individual cultures.	(02)
G-12	Why the distinction –20-22 for Francophone 6 and 9 for Aboriginal.	(33)
G-13	Many of these are not unique to Social Studies.	(01)
G-14	Distinctive principle separately written statements are excellent.	(02)
G-15	Concern regarding absence of contemporary and current events.	(01)
G-16	Assessment.	(01)
G-17	Disagree with definition of spirituality.	(01)
G-18	Too specific/remove 6,9,20,21,22.	(08)
G-19	Inconsistency – Principles #4 and page 13 – Aboriginal people.	(01)
G-20	Thinking skills development “casually” mentioned, but not emphasized.	(01)
G-21	Need to be thinking more about academic principles.	(01)
G-22	Some principles are too specific and prescriptive in nature.	(01)
G-23	All students should be aware of issues relating to Francophone, Aboriginal and other cultures.	(01)
G-24	Overlap with role of Social Studies.	(04)
G-29	Specific comments.	(22)
G-98	Generally negative comments.	(05)
G-99	Other comments e.g. implementation, resources.	(05)

## **STATEMENT 1**

### **SUPPORT**

1-48	Generally positive comments.	(06)
------	------------------------------	------

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

1-01 Comments/suggestions. (05)

## **STATEMENT 2**

### **SUPPORT**

2-48 Generally positive comments. (04)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

2-01 Comments/suggestions. (05)

## **STATEMENT 3**

### **SUPPORT**

3-48 Generally positive comments. (09)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

3-01 Comments/suggestions. (13)

3-98 Generally negative comments. (02)

## **STATEMENT 4**

### **SUPPORT**

4-48 Generally positive comments. (05)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

4-01 Comments/suggestions. (02)

4-98 Generally negative comments. (01)

## **STATEMENT 5**

### **SUPPORT**

5-48 Generally positive comments. (04)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 5-01 Comments/suggestions. (10)  
5-98 Generally negative comments. (01)

## **STATEMENT 6**

### **SUPPORT**

- 6-48 Generally positive comments. (03)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 6-01 Comments/suggestions. (08)  
6-98 Generally negative comments. (02)

## **STATEMENT 7**

### **SUPPORT**

- 7-48 Generally positive comments. (03)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 7-01 Comments/suggestions. (05)

## **STATEMENT 8**

### **SUPPORT**

- 8-48 Generally positive comments. (04)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 8-01 Comments/suggestions. (08)  
8-98 Generally negative comments. (01)

## **STATEMENT 9**

### **SUPPORT**

- 9-48 Generally positive comments. (01)

## **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 9-01 Comments/suggestions. (16)
- 9-98 Generally negative comments. (03)

## **STATEMENT 11**

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 11-01 Comments/suggestions. (05)

## **STATEMENT 12**

### **SUPPORT**

- 12-48 Generally positive comments. (03)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 12-01 Comments/suggestions. (01)
- 12-98 Generally negative comments. (01)

## **STATEMENT 13**

### **SUPPORT**

- 13-48 Generally positive comments. (04)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 13-01 Comments/suggestions. (04)

## **STATEMENT 14**

### **SUPPORT**

- 14-48 Generally positive comments. (08)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 14-01 Comments/suggestions. (05)

## **STATEMENT 15**

### **SUPPORT**

15-48 Generally positive comments. (02)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

15-01 Comments/suggestions. (02)

15-98 Generally negative comments. (01)

## **STATEMENT 16**

### **SUPPORT**

16-48 Generally positive comments. (07)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

16-01 Comments/suggestions. (02)

16-98 Generally negative comments. (03)

## **STATEMENT 17**

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

17-01 Comments/suggestions. (02)

17-98 Generally negative comments. (01)

## **STATEMENT 18**

### **SUPPORT**

18-48 Generally positive comments. (02)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

18-01 Comments/suggestions. (03)

18-98 Generally negative comments. (01)

## **STATEMENT 19**

### **SUPPORT**

19-48 Generally positive comments. (02)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

19-01 Comments/suggestions. (06)

19-98 Generally negative comments. (05)

## **STATEMENT 20**

### **SUPPORT**

20-48 Generally positive comments. (01)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

20-01 Comments/suggestions. (09)

## **STATEMENT 21**

### **SUPPORT**

21-48 Generally positive comments. (01)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

21-01 Comments/suggestions. (03)

## **STATEMENT 22**

### **SUPPORT**

22-48 Generally positive comments. (01)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

22-01 Comments/suggestions. (04)

## **STATEMENT 24**

### **SUPPORT**

24-48 Generally positive comments. (03)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

24-01 Comments/suggestions. (02)

## **STATEMENT 27**

### **SUPPORT**

27-48 Generally positive comments. (04)

### **CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

27-01 Comments/suggestions. (01)

## **QUESTION 7 – MODEL**

### **1-49 SUPPORT**

05 Whole section – generally supportive. (72)

06 Vision.

07 Graph.

10 Distinctive outcomes – generally supportive. (06)

11 Distinct outcome – move to introduction. (02)

12 Distinct outcome – move to separate document. (02)

20 Organizers/generally supportive. (15)

### **50-99 CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

51 Whole section – generally negative. (04)

52 Cannot comment/hard to comment. (03)

53 Needs to be more developed. (03)

- 55 Vision/model – more work needed. (08)
- 57 Graph – add language-culture-identity-community. (01)
- 60 Distinctive outcomes – generally negative.
- 61 Distinct outcome – for AB/FR problematic/remove/separate document. (15)
- 62 Distinct outcome – for other students/multicultural groups. (14)
- 63 Distinct outcome – need to be more developed/better defined. (02)
- 64 Distinct outcome – have an impact on assessment. (04)
- 65 Distinct outcome – are a challenge; teachers with AB/FR in regular classroom need help. (10)
- 66 Distinct outcome – 80% common and 20% optional instead. (02)
- 70 Organizers – generally negative. (04)
- 71 Organizers – change order or number. (06)
- 72 Organizers – add new organizer (economics, technology, current events). (05)
- 73 Organizers – add concepts within organizers - see list below (17)  
*technological advance, past history, diversity individualism tolerance-conflict resolution/ethical decision-making, Canadian and World History, resources/climate, individual/society, Intersection people/places, multidimensional citizenship, Information literacy/technology, nationalism, more identity, Collective identity/current events, economics, responsibilities, Develop more citizenship, current events, develop/distribute Resources, geography*
- 74 Organizers – better tie needed to guiding principles/role. (03)
- 75 Organizers – history (global, canadian) needs to be emphasized, developed. (13)
- 76 Organizers – include/develop more values/attitudes/behaviors. (05)



77 Organizers - concerns re assessment of values/behaviors.	(01)
94 Concerns re evaluation.	(07)
95 Provide samples/examples/activities.	(03)
96 Concerns about resources.	(02)
97 Concerns about budgets.	(01)
99 Other comments/one of a kind.	(24)
00 N/A; deal with other sections/cryptic	(03)

## QUESTION 8 – ABORIGINAL PERSPECTIVE

### 1-49 SUPPORT

01 Very valuable and necessary background information.	(04)
02 The Aboriginal perspective has been included in a meaningful way and effective distinctive curriculum objectives can be achieved.	(01)
03 Aboriginal peoples have been marginalized too long, this voice is commendable.	(02)
04 The direction is sound and entirely defensible.	(01)
05 The philosophy behind this is good.	(01)
06 This provides a concise perspective of Aboriginal people... not seen anything similar before.	(01)
07 Acknowledges the unique aspects and importance of Aboriginal people.	(01)
08 Acknowledges Aboriginal influence and contributions to our society.	(02)
09 This has been sadly lacking in the past.	(01)
10 I feel important for all our teachers to be aware of this umbrella group, history, etc.	(02)

- 11 This is very important within our curriculum. (01)
- 12 You've obviously listened to the native stakeholders. (01)
- 13 It is important that the Aboriginal needs and perspectives are included in the document. (02)
- 14 Historically accurate and well described. (01)
- 15 Glad to see the inclusion of the definition of spirituality to clarify Aboriginal beliefs. (01)
- 16 This is well explained and needs to become part of the foundation document... inclusion recognizes special diversity. (01)
- 17 Engender understanding for all students respecting Aboriginal culture. (01)
- 18 We, the cultural majority, should respect, appreciate, integrate and express the Aboriginal heritage. (02)
- 19 Misunderstanding.
- 48 Generally positive comments. (53)

**50-99 CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 50 Questions the need for distinctive outcomes and delivery of them. (07)
- 51. Not clear if one curriculum or separate curriculum for Aboriginal students (01)
- 52. Too much emphasis on Aboriginal and Francophone perspectives while ignoring or at the expense of other cultures. (32)
- 53 Is the statement an attempt to do "social reconstruction"? (04)
- 54 Add a statement (as in the vision) that the social studies programs will engender understanding for all students respecting Aboriginal culture. (01)
- 55 There should be an attempt to explain why Aboriginal and Francophones are now being highlighted. (01)

- 56 Need consistency between Aboriginal and Francophone statements/sections. (03)
- 57 Too political/preachy in tone. (02)
- 58 Encourage educators to further their professional development in this area.. need to know more. (01)
- 59 Definition of spirituality, whose interpretation and teaching “religion” in school. (04)
- 60 The definition of Aboriginal perspective and terminology is unclear. (02)
- 61 Will be difficult to teach because of oral traditions. (02)
- 62 The Aboriginal section should not be in the principle document. (10)
- 63 Aboriginal students should attend weekend programs for this purpose/family’s job. (02)
- 64 Students and teachers need more information about Aboriginal people. (04)
- 65 The Aboriginal Perspective needs to be included in the model. (03)
- 66 Spirituality is not uniquely Aboriginal. (02)
- 67 Aboriginal perspective needs a separate document. (08)
- 68 There is more than one Aboriginal perspective. (04)
- 69 Implications that Aboriginals are the only caretakers of the land is offensive. (01)
- 70 Questioning terminology i.e. Education has contributed to erosion... (04)
- 71 Some components should be taught by Aboriginals. (03)
- 72 Need multi-cultural perspective.
- 73 More detail needed to explain Aboriginal perspective, some are totally acculturated. (03)

- 74 Include Aboriginal concerns, issues throughout the curriculum. (01)
- 75 Address Aboriginal perspectives in Upper grades. (01)
- 76 Aboriginal students needs are not being met.
- 97 Difficult to comment on. (27)
- 98 Generally negative comments. (07)
- 99 Other information not pertaining to the question. (10)

## **QUESTION 9 – FRANCOPHONE PERSPECTIVE**

### **1-49 SUPPORT**

- 48 Generally supportive. (25)
- 47 Generally supportive for specific reasons. (22)

### **50-99 CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 50 Questions the need for distinctive outcomes and delivery of them. (01)
- 51 Do not want to comment (not enough knowledge, Francophones should comment). (12)
- 52 Take section out. (02)
- 53 Put section in a different document or appendices. (07)
- 54. Definitions necessary (assert, additive bilingualism, culture for Francophone students, exogamy). (04)
- 55. All students have the same needs as Francophones (self-esteem, culture, identity). (09)
- 56. All cultural groups should be promoted not just the Francophones /too much emphasis on Francophones and Heritage. (27)
- 57. Francophone group should be promoted/integrated as part of Multiculturalism. (05)

- 58. Concerns over emphasis on diversity, distinctiveness, separateness, Francophone identity, versus inclusion, unity, commonality, Canadian identity. (08)
- 59. Section deals with protection of culture/social Engineering/politics. (04)
- 60. Ensure it is not done at the expense of global issues, social studies, critical inquiry. (03)
- 97. Difficult to comment on. (01)
- 98 Generally negative comments. (13)
- 99 Other comments – one of a kind /very specific. (26)
- 00 N/A, refer to other sections of document/too cryptic confusion – quite a few of the comments deal with the Aboriginal section. (14)

## **QUESTION 10 – FRENCH IMMERSION**

### **1-49 SUPPORT**

- 48 Generally supportive. (18)
- 47 Generally supportive for specific reasons. (14)

### **50-99 CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**

- 51 Do not want to comment (not enough knowledge, no idea). (09)
- 52 Take section out. (01)
- 53 Put section in a different document or appendices. (02)
- 54 Include section within document not appendices. (02)
- 55 Do not single out one group, provide for all students/groups. (04)
- 56 There is already enough Francophone culture/immersion students do not need more than other students . (07)
- 57 Concerns about resources. (08)
- 58 Objection to statement "results are as good or higher than." (09)

- 59 Joie de vivre cliché. (05)
- 99 Generally negative comments. (05)
- 99 Other comments/one of a kind. (11)
- 00 N/A, refer to other sections of document/too cryptic confusion; many N/A comments deal with the Francophone section. (30)

## QUESTION 11 – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS

### 1-49 SUPPORT

- 01 Classroom teachers would benefit greatly from looking at the "broad philosophical directions" found in the Foundation Document Philosophically. I agree and like the Foundation Document. (02)
- 02 Point #1 of part 4 is a great opening statement because it "impowers people". I like it very much. (01)
- 03 Incorporation of L.A., drama, music, etc. is excellent. (01)
- 04 Strongly in favor of Aboriginal culture and Francophone community being addressed in any revision of the P of S – plural perspectives. Impressed with Aboriginal and Francophone components. (08)
- 05 Impressed with the goals set for citizenship, high academic goals, etc. (02)
- 06 Increasing emphasis without it being perceived as preferential remains that balancing act which will be the focus on this document/process/and program. (04)
- 07 Session went well opportunity to respond. (14)
- 08 Like the concept and initial steps intent. (02)
- 09 This document celebrates a mosaic versus melting pot theory!! (01)
- 10 Impressed with consultation process. (03)
- 11 Support the strong theme/approach of valuing diversity and respecting others that is evident. (01)

- 12 Pleased with the reversal of depth and breadth. (01)
- 48 Generally positive comments. (40)
- 50-99 CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS/CONCERNS**
50. Allow Social Studies organizers to drive the process and suggestions. (03)
- 51 Concerned that the document which appears comprehensive in nature will be vague and nebulous when translated into curricular areas... important to look at developmental stages of learning for children when preparing curriculum materials. (06)
- 52 Curriculum is set up to meet the needs of two special interest groups. Emphasis on Francophone and Aboriginal will result in negativity divisive rather than inclusive and uniting. (63)
- 53 Inservice is vital and linked to maintaining high standards implementation. (05)
- 54 Need much more input from people who will be employing your graduates in 2015 – please! (01)
- 55 Document would be more concise if the specific references for Aboriginals and French were consolidated. (03)
- 56 Confusing whether this will be one curriculum or one with two distinct add ons. Make it clear. (03)
- 57 Reflect issues of career development. (01)
- 58 More emphasis on third group – needed multicultural Anglophone. (11)
- 59 Need parallel structure within "Role of Social Studies" (#4) and "Guiding Principles" (#5). (01)
- 60 Do not agree/like the term English Language Group. (01)
- 61 Include Aboriginal culture – page 7, #24. (01)
- 62 Standardized testing concerns. (03)
- 63 Social Studies doesn't try to be everything to everyone. Scope is very large, maybe too large for one curriculum. (03)

- 64 Include female/gender perspective and issue. (05)
- 65 Role of Social Studies needs to be streamlined/rewritten. (03)
- 66 One of the purposes of Social Studies (p.4) is to create a sense of belonging for all. (01)
- 67 Should not get so bogged down with philosophies. (01)
- 68 "Rethink" the VISION - broaden it!! (01)
- 69 Resources developed. (07)
- 70 Need more time to review document. (02)
- 71 Need more global perspective. (03)
- 72 Need to address needs of students with learning disabilities or special needs. (02)
- 73 Need more education about the spiritual values and beliefs of the native people. (01)
- 74 Aboriginal people are really the only distinct and separate culture and it has been overlooked by educators. (01)
- 75 Assessment should be included. (01)
- 76 How can this curriculum unilaterally address Aboriginal component treating them as one ethnic group when amongst them the Aboriginals are multiethnic/multicultural. (01)
- 77 More emphasis on inquiry. (02)
- 78 "Core" or complementary. (01)
- 79 More war history. (01)
- 80 Streaming of programs important. (01)
- 81 Definition page good but could be more inclusive. (01)
- 82 Needs to be built-in flexibility. (01)
- 83 Consider adding separate history and geography courses. (01)



84	Mention immigration.	(01)
85	More emphasis on processes than content.	(02)
86	Add technology outcomes.	(01)
87	Increase emphasis on academics and the importance of having a solid knowledge and skills base.	(01)
88	Guiding Principles – Bullet 4 and #6 important in grade3 lower elementary.	(02)
89	Importance of current affairs, being aware and understand the responsibility of all Canadians (of all ages) to keep up with issues and events in their community and in their country and the world.	(03)
90	Incorporate technology in document.	(01)
96	Specific suggestions.	(18)
97	Celebration Canada (Citizenship Matters) ideas – submissions.	(01)
98	Generally negative comments.	(06)

